

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action. The present amendment is intended to place the application in condition for allowance and is believed to overcome all of the objections and rejections made by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Applicant has canceled claim 22, and amended claims 1 and 19 to more properly claim the present invention. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 - 5 and 19 - 22 are presented for examination.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that a certified copy of the priority document, Israel Patent Application No. 124895, filed on June 14, 1998, was not filed. Pursuant to MPEP §201.14(b), as a divisional application, Applicant identifies that the certified copy can be located in the parent case. However, if there is any problem in locating the certified copy, Applicant will obtain another copy.

In Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that items AM - AW of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on July 24, 2000 were not placed in the application file, and that identification of these items in the IDS fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR §1.97, §1.98 and MPEP §609. Accordingly, Applicant is filing an IDS with proper identification, and submitting copies of the items cited.

In paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 19, 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Marmor, U.S. Patent No. 6,601,108 ("Marmor"). Applicant has canceled claim 22 without acquiescence to the Examiner's reasons for rejection and respectfully submits that rejection of that claim is thus rendered moot.

In paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Marmor in view of LeMole et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,009,410 ("LeMole").

Distinctions between Claimed Invention and U.S. Patent No. 6,601,108 to Marmor in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,009,410 to LeMole et al.

The present invention concerns a method and apparatus for protecting text delivered from a server computer to a client computer over a network, from being copied. The present invention preferably converts the protected text into a non-editable form, such as a graphic image of the protected text, so that it cannot be copied and edited (present specification / page 1, lines 17 – 23; page 2, lines 6 – 8; page 2, line 17 – page 3, line 11; page 5, lines 3 – 17; page 8, line 4 – page 9, line 17; FIGS. 1 and 2). The server computer preferably stores the editable text in a storage area that is not accessible to the client computer, and stores the non-editable form of the text in a storage area that is accessible to the client (present specification / page 8, lines 10 and 11, lines 21 – 24; elements 18 and 20 of FIGS. 1 and 2).

Marmor describes an automatic conversion system for processing multi-lingual inputs and outputs, so as to enable interoperability between computers that do not have the necessary multi-lingual capabilities. As indicated by the Examiner, Marmor describes converting text data to image data, when a client computer does not support the required fonts (Marmor / col. 5, lines 3 – 17).

LeMole describes generating customized advertising web pages for a user, based on the user's profile and previous web pages that the user has browsed. The customized advertising web page pulls images and banners from an advertising database that stores content from a plurality of advertisers, and includes hyperlinks that enable the user to directly access an advertiser's web site (LeMole / col. 2, lines 13 - 46).

In distinction to the present invention, Marmor and LeMole do not teach storing editable text in a storage area of a server computer that is not accessible to client computers, and storing editable text in a storage area that is accessible to client computers.

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5 and 22 citing col. 5, lines 3 – 17, col. 4, lines 35 – 41, col. 5, lines 3 – 44, and FIGS. 1A and 1B of Marmor. Applicant respectfully submits that the limitation in claim 22

of “*a first storage area that is inaccessible to said computer terminal for storing said text-editable textual information and a second storage area that is accessible to said computer terminal for storing said non-text-editable textual information*” is not described in Marmor. Accordingly, applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 19 so as to incorporate this limitation of claim 22.

The rejections of claims 1 – 5 and 19 - 21 in paragraphs 5 - 8 of the Office Action will now be dealt with specifically.

As to amended independent method claim 1, applicant respectfully submits that the limitation in claim 1 of:

“wherein said text-editable textual information is stored in a first storage area of said server that is inaccessible to said computer terminal, and said non-text-editable textual information is stored in a second storage area of said server that is accessible to said computer”

is neither shown nor suggested in Marmor or LeMole.

Because claims 2 - 5 depend from claim 1 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 - 5 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Marmor and LeMole, taken alone or in combination.

Accordingly claims 1 - 5 are deemed to be allowable.

As to amended independent system claim 19, applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claim 19 of:

“a first storage area that is inaccessible to said computer terminal for storing said text-editable textual information”; and

“a second storage area that is accessible to said computer terminal for storing said non-text-editable textual information”

are neither shown nor suggested in Marmor or LeMole.

Because claims 20 and 21 depend from claim 19 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 20 and 21 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Marmor and LeMole, taken alone or in combination.

Accordingly claims 19 - 21 are deemed to be allowable.

Support for Amended Claims in Original Specification


Amended claims 1 and 19 incorporate limitations from original claims 5 and 22.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance.


Dated: November 25, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043
Telephone: 650-856-6500
Facsimile: 650-843-8777

By 
Marc A. Sockol
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 40,823

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on
Date: November 25, 2003 By: 

Eileen Janikowski

PaloAlto/61596.1